DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 051 CS 504 468

AUTHOR Griffin, Em
TITLE Communication Patterns in Four Types of Intimate Friendship.
PUB DATE Nov 83
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (69th, Washington, DC, November 10-13, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; College Students; *Communication Research; Females; *Friendship; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Attraction; *Interpersonal Communication; Males; Social Life
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Patterns

ABSTRACT

To compare differences between types of friendships on an assortment of communication and situational variables, a study was conducted that involved pairs of four types of intimate friends: male-male, female-female, male-female with romantic interest, and male-female without romantic interest. Subjects, 61 pairs of college students, completed measures gauging (1) months of closeness, (2) self-disclosure, (3) communication efficiency, (4) protection of partner, (5) touch behavior, (6) similarity of academic interests, (7) perceived status, (8) extent of caring, and (9) probability of future emotional and geographic closeness. Results indicated that, overall, there was little difference among friendship types. However, male pairs gave evidence of greater stability while the nonromantic cross-sex pair tended to be more volatile than the other friendship types. Romantic pairs were the most certain of future commitment, while female pairs had the least control over the future of their relationship. (Author/FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED238051

COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN FOUR TYPES OF INTIMATE FRIENDSHIP

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Em Griffin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Em Griffin
Wheaton College

Presented at 1983 Speech Communication Association Convention
Washington D.C.

Four types of close friendship were analyzed to ascertain differences in communication pattern, attitude and circumstance. Volunteer pairs of same sex male, same sex female, cross sex romantic and cross sex platonic friends responded to ten measures. Scores were obtained on: months of closeness, self-disclosure, communication efficiency in Password, protection of partner, touch, similarity of academic interest, perceived status, the Caring Relationship Inventory, and estimated prbability of future emotional and geographic closeness. Overall there was little difference between friendship types. However, male pairs did give evidence of greater stability while the platonic cross sex friendships tended to be more volitile. Romantic couples were most certain of future commitment, while female pairs had less control over the future of the relationship. The "Being Love" scale of the Caring Relationship Inventory which is based on Maslow's concept of self-actualization proved to be a consistent predictor of other measures.

CS 504 468

INTRODUCTION

The bulk of interpersonal research reported in communication journals has been undertaken with subjects who are strangers, mere acquaintances, or casual friends. There is now a recent surge of interest into patterns of communication between intimate friends, but little has been done to differentiate responses among qualitatively separate types of friendships. This paper reports the results of an exploratory study among four types of intimate friends: male-male, female-female, male-female with romantic interest (romantic), and male-female without romantic goals (platonic). The purpose of the study is twofold: 1) To compare differences between types of friendships on an assortment of communication and situational variables. 2) To identify present responses that are significant predictors of continued closeness after graduation.

Subjects were undergraduate volunteers at Wheaton College, a private liberal arts school with a strong Christian ideological stance. When they responded by phone to a recruitment poster or newsletter announcement, they were asked whether there was anyone else on campus to whom they were closer. An affirmative response disqualified them for the study. Freshman were also excluded from participation. Pairs of friends were scheduled four at a time--one pair for each type of friendship. Upon arrival each person was asked separately how many people on campus he or she was closer to than the person they were with. A response of any number other than zero caused the data from the pair to be discarded later. A total of 61 pairs qualified for the study.

Male-Male	15
Female-Female	17
Romantic	16
Platonic	13

During the course of the eighty minute session, Ss responded to 10 different measures. I took pains to assure Ss of present anonymity. They did, however, leave their name, home address and the names of others who might know their location three years

hence in a sealed envelope. Augmented by lists from the college alumni office, this data will provide the basis for a follow up study in 1986.

I selected the ten friendship measures on the basis of literature in the field of intimacy plus the combined wisdom of participants in a seminar on intimate communication. Although previous research has established all ten as meaningful variables, I made no attempt to predict between friendship types. The descriptive data that comes out of this study will provide the basis for future hypothesis testing. The procedure and results of each measure are presented together. The paper concludes with an overall analysis.

MONTHS OF CLOSENESS

Subjects were asked when they first became close friends. The question was included on the rationale that friendship which demonstrated staying power might reasonably be expected to be currently deeper, and longer lasting in the future. All responses were converted to months of closeness. As might be expected there was an extremely high correlation between partners as to when a deep friendship was established. (Pearson-product moment r=.96) The lack of such agreement would be a warning flag to call into question whether I was indeed dealing with intimate relationships. What I didn't anticipate, however, was a desparity in length of friendship between conditions. Table 1 shows these differences.

Table 1
MONTHS OF CLOSENESS

	Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
Months of Closeness	29.8	18.6	21.3	12.7
Reciprocity of Response	.98	.91	.98	.69

A one way ANOVA yields an F of 5.531 (df 3,118) which was significant at the .001 level. A Newman-Keuls test shows that the

difference is between the male-male friendships and all other pairs. Guys had been close friends on the average of 2½ years. They contrasted with romantic couples of 1 3/4 years, female friends a year and a half, and platonic couples of 1 year.

There are two possible explanations for the wide range of differences. Obviously subjects were not randomly assigned to conditions. They self-selected themselves for the study. Perhaps all types of friendships on campus have the same mean duration, but for some unknown systematic reason I ended up with pairs that differed across conditions. If so, all other analyses in the study would not really be testing differences between types of friendships, but differences caused by length of friendship. An analysis of the data does not support this explanation. Months of closeness correlated highly with only two other variables in the study--probability of future closeness and geographic proximity. An analysis of covariance using months of closeness as the covariant reduced the within group variance less than 2% on such items as self disclosure, perceived status of partner and communication efficiency. So it is not likely that months of closeness is the unintended independent variable of the study.

The other possibility is that there is indeed something in the nature of guy-guy friendships that make them more stable. While the design of the study prohibits us from drawing a definite conclusion, the reciprocity data lends credence to that speculation. Reciprocity coefficients were computed for 19 key measures in the study. These are presented in each section. Male-male pairs exceeded the .05 level of significance in 12 of these cases. The next highest total was 10 in the female-female condition. The other two conditions had 7.

The pattern of student sign-up also suggests that this is the way that close male-male friendships really are. When the study was announced I easily obtained a full compliment of female-female and romantic pairs. The male-male and platonic couples were much harder to come by. My hunch is that there are relatively fewer close male-male friendships out there--but those

that exist have staying power. The cross sex non romantic friendships, in comparison, show a much more volitile pattern. Perhaps it's not by accident that David Michaelis in his book, The Best of Friends, selects six male-male life long friendships to illustrate the nature of intimate bonding.

SELF-DISCLOSURE

Self-disclosure is the coin-of-the-realm in interpersonal closeness. Altmann & Taylor (1973) see it as the necessary process that transforms mere attraction into an intimate relationship. Many view mutual self-disclosure as an operational definition of friendship. An Arabian proverb holds that a friend is "one to whom one may pour out all the contents of one's heart, chaff and grain together knowing that the gentlest of hands will take and sift it, keep what is worth keeping and with the breath of kindness blow the rest away."

It's easier to affirm the importance of self-disclosure than it is to measure its occurance. The oft employed Jourard (1971) paradigm offers a series of scales on six different topics. The S's response indicates the frequency of disclosure. Ss respond to statements such as: "I tell others about what I like best in my work." There are a number of problems with this approach. It treats self disclosure as a trait in an individual rather than a transaction between two parties. It accepts a self report as adequately reflecting actual behavior. And it assumes that disclosure is accurately received when the speaker puts his thoughts into words. (See Cline (1982) for a critique of past measuring techniques.)

In order to measure self-disclosure as a successful communication transaction, Ss were given a "Personal Inventory" made up of twelve questions drawn from Jourard's six areas--attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, work, money, personality, body. The specific items were selected on the basis of the relatively high risk inherent in sharing the information with others. After Ss completed the form for themselves, they were given an identical form to fill out as they thought their friend would respond.

(Devotees of daytime TV may recognize the similarities to the procedure on the "Newlywed Game.") Each "hit" or "match" received a point toward a total self disclosure score. Originally I planned to have Ss self score their own form based on the premise that "words don't mean things, people mean things." They knew what they meant and could judge if this friend understood them. But in pretesting I discovered that the high scoial desirability of successful self-disclosure caused some to credit partner responses that were blatently wrong. Therefore Ss received a self-disclosure point only when both they and an independent rater agreed that there was a legitimate match.

The results shown in Table 2 reflect no difference between types of friendships.

Table 2
SELF-DISCLOSURE

	Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
Disclosure	6.50	7.02	7.06	6.95
Reciprocity of Response	.44	.80	.59	.61

The scores range from 0-14. The oft reported finding that males disclose less than females was not confirmed in this study. I would speculate that this may indeed be true in casual relationships, but that close friendships call forth deep disclosure irrespective of gender. While no differences between conditions were discovered, a strong reciprocity factor was confirmed. Derlega and Chaikin (1975) report that partners tend to gravitate toward the same level of disclosure. This reciprocity can be seen in the correlation coefficients for pairs. All are significantly different from chance at the .05 level. "You tell me your dream and I'll tell you mine" is not an idle promise.

PASSWORD

Password is a linguistic game that has previously been used to measure communication efficiency. A player gives one word clues

in an effort to get his partner to guess the target word. The fewer number of clues, the more efficient the communication. In this study each member of the pair had a list of eight words to establish. There were ten such lists rotated in a Latin square design so that each friendship condition faced equal difficulty.

Table 3 shows the mean number of clues it took a pair to correctly guess the words. A low score reflects greater success. There is no significant difference between conditions.

Table 3
PASSWORD

Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
51.93	52.35	48.06	50.85

PROTECTION OF PARTNER

On the basis of ten in-depth interviews with pairs of intimate friends (4 male-male, 4 female-female, 2 platonic), Rawling (1983) established that there is a tension between an individual's desire to self-disclose and a contrasting reticence to bring up material that will cause pain for his friend. In order to measure the range of protection, Ss were presented with a list of 33 topics that might prove touchy for their friend. These included family tensions, mental stability, slopiness/neatness, diet and grades in school. They received the following instructions:

> It is possible that you have discovered some touchy areas in your friend's life that cause him or her distress. Discussion of these subjects is painful for your friend, so you exercise some restraint in raising these issues. You censor your feedback or avoid the subject altogether, not because you are afraid of your friend's reaction toward you, but rather you desire to protect him or her from needless hurt. Experience has shown that candor here is counter-productive, so you don't broach the topic. Listed below are a number of areas which could occasion pain. If you don't shy away from talking about that issue for fear of causing pain, check

> the far left column marked "Not a sensitive issue." If the subject is a touchy one however, select the response which indicates the degree of hurt you perceive.

Ss could select from four increasingly traumatic options: slightly tender, a sore spot, real pain, a gaping wound. The scores in Table 4 represent the mean "slightly tender" frequency count. There are no significant differences. The reciprocity of response is positive for all conditions, but significantly different from zero only among the female-female pairs. The four levels of response were offered in an effort to determine depth of potential hurt. But Ss rarely used the more intense options. The mean for "a sore spot" across conditions was 2.5, and it was less than 1.0 for the higher levels.

Table 4
PROTECTION OF PARTNER

	Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
Number of slightly tender areas	10.13	9.73	10.16	8.69
Reciprocity of response	.21	.50	.39	.28

TOUCH

Subjects responded to a touch survey patterned after a Guttman scaleogram. Beginning with "occasional brush while walking" and concluding with "sexual intercourse," it listed 23 touch behaviors of increasing intimacy. Birdwhistell (1970) notes that sequence is crucial in interpreting touch behavior. "Holding hands" (#8) was the only item on the scale which defied placement. To some it was akin to a back rub (#6), to others it paired with extended holding (#11). There was of course a striking difference between friendship conditions. ($F=112.23$, $df=3,112$, $p<.0001$). Note in Table 5 that the mean for male-male friends represents a back rub, for female-female pairs a long embrace, platonic

couples a kiss on the cheek or hair, and romantic couples a touch in the genital area with clothes on. A Neuman-Keuls analysis shows that all conditions are significantly different from each other except for female and platonic friends. So male friends tend to engage only in brief or ritualistic touch. Female friends and platonic pairs usually experience extended periods of touch. Romantic couples in this study reported erotic touch.

Table 5
TOUCH BEHAVIOR

	Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
Touch Level	6.25	8.94	19.38	9.96
Reciprocity of Response	.75	.62	.30	.95

The correlation of reciprocity differed significantly from zero at the .05 level in all cases except the romantic pairs. It's difficult to imagine partners having different perception of the same tactile encounters. Two explanations for the low figure seem apparent. Participants attend a Christian college where restraint of sexual expression before marriage is expected. Even though Ss were assured of ananymity there may have been a reticence on the part of one participant to indicate the actual level of physical intimacy. It is also possible that the survey was ambiguous in its instructional set to "check each catagory of touching behaviors in which you and your friend have engaged." One can imagine, for instance, the indecision of the respondant who had received but not given genital touch.

Jourard (1968) has hypothesized a positive relationship between touch and self-disclosure. He sees both behaviors as a form of vulnurability, yet has failed to empirically establish the linkage. Table 6 shows the correlation between these two variables in the four different types of friendship. The Pearson product-moment coefficient is positive and significant at the .05 level in male-male, female-female and platonic friendships.

A very different pattern emerges among romantic pairs. Not only is there a negative relationship, it approaches statistical significance. One would think that a 21 month average period of being close would give ample time for transparent discussion, but perhaps a couple reaches a decision early on whether to talk or touch.

Table 6

TOUCH SELF-DISCLOSURE CORRELATION

Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
.42	.31	-.26	.49

SIMILARITY OF INTEREST

Byrne (1971) and a host of others have established that attraction is heightened by similarity. For most undergraduates their field of study is a crucial factor in how they see themselves. Ss indicated their academic majors as part of the study. The specific majors were collapsed into four catagories: Humanities, Social Science, Physical Science, Religion. The number of matches for each condition by each academic field are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

SIMILARITY OF MAJORS

	Total Ss	Matched Pairs			
		Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
Humanities	31	1	1	0	2
Social Sciences	62	4	5	4	5
Physical Sciences	12	1	0	0	0
Religion	17	2	1	1	0
	Total	8	7	5	7

Given the distribution of majors, there is an expected chance probability of .33 that a pair of friends would pursue the same academic area. In actuality, 27 of 61 pairs matched up--44%. The difference between expected frequency and the observed frequency provides a z score of 1.65, significant in a one tailed test at the .05 level. Birds of a feather did flock together. A x^2 analysis showed no difference between conditions.

PERCEIVED STATUS

Recent work in relational communication (Millar and Rogers, 1976) suggests that status is a crucial variable between close friends. Messages can be coded one up (↑), one down (↓), or one across (→) as a means of determining a person's attempt to establish dominance, respond submissively or maintain mutuality. The success or failure of this effort may depend on how the second party perceives their relative status. Keller and Brown (1974) suggest that mutual control is an appropriate ethic for interpersonal communication. This balance would be hard to maintain if parties in a close friendship saw their relative status as discrepant.

Each subject was confronted by six scales on which they could place an "X" to represent their friend in relationship to their own position.

Lesser_____Greater
↑
you

A mark on the right side of the scale indicated that they saw their partner as superior in this particular area. The distance from the central arrow reflects the magnitude of the perceived discrepancy. Six areas were selected on the basis of content analysis of conversation with students concerning status. They are physical attractiveness, spiritual maturity, intellectual ability, social skills, physical coordination and financial resources.

The scores for each status area are presented in Table 8. A positive score reflects a relative idealization of the friend, whereas a negative score shows that the respondant sees him or herself as superior in that area. A MANOVA reveals no significant difference between conditions, although the differences approached significance in the area of finances. (.077) There was, however, a main effect by sex. ($F=7.51$, $df=1,2,54$, $p<.0001$) The differences are presented in Table 9 and are significant in the areas of spiritual maturity, intellectual ability and physical coordination.

Table 8

PERCEIVED STATUS X CONDITION

	Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
Attraction	.93	1.94	6.75	.48
Spiritual	1.90	3.56	2.38	4.76
Intelligence	.47	5.76	2.38	2.12
Social	1.40	2.91	2.25	5.32
Physical	-1.07	.97	4.41	-2.28
Financial	-3.10	- .41	2.16	-1.72
Sum of all	.54	14.73	19.90	8.68

Table 9

PERCEIVED STATUS X SEX

	Male	Female
Attraction	3.32	2.03
Spiritual	- .04	5.56
Intelligence	- .22	5.68
Social	3.58	2.18
Physical	-3.76	4.95
Financial	.32	-1.61
Sum of all	.20	18.79

Females tended to downgrade their own assets and elevate their friend's desirable qualities. This idealization occured regardless of whether their friend was male or female. Males on the other hand took a more balanced view of their partner. This difference can be seen when each S's six scores are summed to determine if he or she ranked higher or lower than the friend. The results are shown in Table 10 in which the positive row represents idealization and the negative row designates partner derogation.

Table 10
SUMMATED PERCEIVED STATUS X SEX

	Male-Male		Female-Female		Romantic		Platonic	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
+	16	0	0	25	8	14	5	10
-	14	0	0	8	7	2	8	2

Eighty percent of the females saw their friend as better than themselves, whereas males split fifty-fifty on the relative status of their partner. The difference is significant at the .001 level ($x^2=12.07$, df=1). Some of the women at Wheaton have been brought up in a tradition of submissiveness to men. This might explain their self-perceived lower status in cross sex relationships. But often both women in the female-female friendship deferred to their partner. It seems that humility for them is not situation specific, but rather a generalized attitude.

Did both members of a pair view their relative status similarly? If so, one would have a positive score of a given magnitude and the other would have a matching negative score. Table 11 shows the reciprocity coefficients for each of the six status areas. A negative correlation indicates high reciprocity. All starred coefficients are significant at the .05 level. All but one of the same sex coefficients meets this test, and that

one is just shy of the mark. The male-male perceptions are particularly stable. On the other hand, only two of the six were significant in each of the mixed sex conditions. Perhaps it is true that love is blind.

Table 11
PERCEIVED STATUS RECIPROCITY

	Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
Attraction	-.43*	-.49*	.01	.16
Spiritual	-.64*	-.43*	.05	-.61*
Intelligence	-.83	-.45*	-.72*	-.32
Social	-.79*	-.42*	-.69*	-.13
Physical	-.87*	-.39	.24	-.12
Financial	-.85*	-.83*	-.31	-.71*

CARING RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

The Caring Relationship Inventory (CRI) was developed by Everett Shostrm (1975) to measure the type and extent of caring which exists in an intimate relationship. Although it was originally intended for cross sex pairs, it can also be used for same sex relationships. Ss respond to 83 true/false descriptive statements concerning their feelings and actions toward their partner. The items are divided into five subscales:

Affection - "Agape", a helping nurturing form of love
Friendship - Peer love based on common interests
Eros - Possessive, romantic form of love
Empathy - Charitable, compassionate love
Self love - Accepting one's weaknesses as well as unique sense of personal worth

Some of the same items are regrouped to measure Maslow's Concepts of Deficiency love and Being love. Table 12 shows the means of each scale for each condition. There are significant differences between conditions in measures of affection, eros, deficiency love and being love.

Table 12
CARING RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

	Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic	F Ratio	Probability
Affection	10.17	10.79	12.094	10.85	7.92	.0001
Friendship	13.30	14.00	13.94	13.73	1.28	---
Eros	5.20	4.65	10.72	6.85	28.41	.0001
Empathy	14.40	14.68	14.44	14.73	.25	---
Self love	13.30	14.0	13.94	13.73	.07	---
Deficiency love	4.47	4.27	5.84	4.85	6.01	.001
Being love	13.53	13.79	14.81	14.12	3.09	.03

A Newman-Keuls procedure was employed to determine the significant differences. The difference in affection scores is between the romantic pairs and all other types of friendship. The same pattern holds for eros scores and deficiency love. But with the eros measure, cross sex platonic friends are also set apart from same sex pairs. As for being love, romantic pairs are significantly different from only the male-male friends.

Table 13 shows the correlation of reciprocity between friends for each CRI measure. The overall pattern reflects a low relationship. There are only three correlations that are significantly different from chance expectancy.

Table 13
CRI RECIPROCITY OF RESPONSE

	Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
Affection	.06	.20	.43*	-.06
Friendship	.12	.15	.34	.32
Eros	.48*	.26	-.05	.11
Empathy	.34	-.06	-.04	.52*
Self love	.11	-.04	-.08	.04
Deficiency love	.34	.10	-.06	-.29
Being love	.31	.25	.23	-.15

FUTURE

Subjects were asked to assess the probability that they would remain close friends two years after graduation. They indicated their response on a scale that went from 0% to 100% in 10% intervals. This question was asked for two reasons. I intend to do a follow up study after a three years time lapse to see which pairs have remained close, I am also curious to see if individuals can accurately predict the future of the relationship when the cost of staying close increases. I assume that an individual's response might be a relative indication of his or her commitment to the relationship.

Table 14 shows the mean for each type of friendship and corresponding reciprocity correlation. There is obviously great overall optimism about the future of their friendships. If the mean probability were applied to the 61 pairs in the study, 51 of these would remain close. It's my imagination that in actuality fewer pairs will remain emotionally close, but only the follow up study will show if I'm a cynic. There was a significant difference between conditions. ($F=3.258$ $df=3,118$ $p=.024$) A Newman-Keuls analysis shows that the romantic pairs are more confident of future closeness than the female-female or platonic friends. The majority of students at this Christian liberal arts college see marriage as the natural outcome of deep romantic involvement. Romantic pairs would therefore anticipate a formal commitment to continue their closeness.

Table 14

PERCEIVED PROBABILITY OF FUTURE CLOSENESS

	Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
Future Probability	.830	.809	.909	.777
Reciprocity of Response	.50	.61	.58	.40

There was a positive correlation between individuals within each friendship condition. This linear relationship varies significantly from chance at the .05 level except for platonic pairs.

The high estimated probability of continued intimacy for the romantic pairs raises the question of whether or not possible future closeness isn't a function of geographic closeness. Participants were asked to indicate on a five point scale how certain they were that they would be living within 50 miles of their friend after graduation. Table 15 shows the mean difference between conditions.

Table 15
GEOGRAPHIC PROXIMITY AFTER GRADUATION

	Male-Male	Female-Female	Romantic	Platonic
Proximity Certainty	2.37	2.18	4.00	2.35
Reciprocity of Response	.70	.15	.71	.53

There is a significant difference between romantic pairs and all others. ($F=25.01$, $df=3,118$, $p<.0001$) Obviously most romantic pairs are planning to locate not only within fifty miles of each other, but within fifty feet. The correlation between location and future closeness is .68 in the romantic pairs. Members of the pair control their geographic destiny by the nature of their relationship. The low reciprocity figure for female-female friends (the only one not significant at the .05 level) may indicate the uncertainty that one or both members of that type of friendship have about future plans. It's not unreasonable to assume that the traditional woman's role of going with her husband is operative on Wheaton's campus.

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to identify differences in communication patterns over four types of friendships. Although some discrepancies were discovered, the overwhelming finding was one of similarity rather than contrast. It is of course impossible

to "prove" that there are no differences--one cannot accept the null hypothesis. But the fact that all three of the verbal communication factors were virtually the same across conditions gives credance to a minimal difference conclusion. No differences in self disclosure, protection of partner or communication efficiency in Password approached statistical significance. Similarity of majors was also spread evenly mong conditions. It is possible, however, to detect nonverbal patterns that distinguish the relationships from each other.

The male-male relationships seem to be characterized by stability. The duration of friendship was considerably longer than other types. Since males had a balanced and mutual perception of their relative status, the relationship was not liable to deteriorate when confronted by cold reality. Males also shared common views of the future potential for the relationship both in geographic and emotional closeness. This overall stability did not seem to be threatened by the lesser needs expressed in the CRI scores or by the lower level of touch activity.

Female-female relationships clustered around the mean for most variables. Women in these relationships did share a low level of power, however. As with females in the mixed pairs, they idealized their partner as to spiritual maturity, intellectual ability and physical coordination. The low reciprocity correlation concerning future geographic residence also suggests a low degree of self determination.

Romantic pairs evidenced differences that justified their self selection into the category. They reported erotic touch, which correlated highly with their elevated scores on the CRI Eros scale (.70). They indicated high affection, deficiency and being needs on the CRI instrument. They were more confident of being together in the future. All of these differences are traditionally viewed outcomes of romance.

Platonic seems almost a misnomer for the mixed sex non romantic friends. They are obviously aware of each other sexually as evidenced on the CRI Eros scale, and guys touch more in this kind of relationship

than with another male friend. Their brief history and lack of mutual agreement as to the possibility of future closeness suggests a more volitile relationship, especially in contrast to the male-male friends.

Despite differences listed above, the weight of the evidence shows remarkably similar patterns over friendship types that are traditionally viewed as diverse. One other unexpected finding appeared. The CRI B scale proved to correlate highly with almost every other variable in the study.

Table 16 presents the significant correlations of CRI B with other measures. These figures are particularly impressive when it is realized that password score and protection of partner correlate neither with each other nor any other variable in the study.

Table 16

CRI B CORRELATION

Variable	Correlation	Probability
Future probability	.39	.001
Location probability	.23	.005
Touch	.37	.001
Status--Physical Attraction	.18	.03
Protection of Partner	-.30	.001
Password	-.27	.001

The negative coefficient for protection of partner reflects the fact that those scoring high on CRI B do not feel the need to censor topics with their friend as much as those who score low. The negative correlation for Password is due to the fact that a low score indicates communication efficiency. So people who scored high on CRI B find their friends more physically attractive than themselves, estimate a high probability of remaining emotionally and physically close after leaving school, touch more, play Password better, and are more open in raising sensitive issues. That's an impressive list. It suggests that the CRI B may be an accurate predictor of continued closeness in 1986.

What exactly does the CRI B measure? It is based on Maslow's concept of the self-actualized individual. The person who has had his deficiency needs met (physiological, security, belongingness and esteem) is free to develop his or her human potential. This includes the ability to reach out to others in a non manipulative way. The items on the CRI B reflect this ability to see others in a I-Thou light. For example:

I respect his individuality.

I like her just as she is, with no changes.

I want what is best for him.

My relationship with her is characterized by trust.

If we regard communication efficiency, openness, touch, confidence of future interaction and appreciation of physical appearance as positive factors in friendship, then the CRI B findings support construct validity for Maslow's ideal of self-actualization. It seems to do nice things for friendship.

REFERENCES

Altman, I. & Taylor, D. Social Penetration. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Birdwhistell, R. "Sequence and Tempo." In Kinesics and Context. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970, 158-163.

Byrne, D. The Attraction Paradigm. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Cline, R. "Revealing and Relating: A Review of Self-Disclosure Theory and Research." Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Meeting, 1982.

Derlega, V. & Chaikin, A. Sharing Intimacy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Jourard, S. Self-Disclosure. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.

Jourard, S. "Physical Contact and Self-Disclosure." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1968, 7, 38-48.

Keller, P. & Brown, C. "An Interpersonal Ethic for Communication." In Jean Civikly (Ed.), Messages. New York: Random House, 1974, 41-47.

Millar, F.E. & Rogers, L.E. "A Relational Approach to Interpersonal Communication." In G.R. Miller (Ed.), Explorations In Interpersonal Communication. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1976, 87-103.

Rawlins, W. "Openness as Problematic in Ongoing Friendships: Two Conversational Dilemmas." Communication Monographs, 1983, 50, 1-13.

Shostrom, E. Caring Relationship Inventory. San Diego, Calif.: EdITS, 1975.